#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VERRECCHIO,

**CIVIL DIVISION** 

Plaintiff;

Docket No.:

VS.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,

COMPLAINT IN CIVIL ACTION

Defendant.

Filed on behalf of Plaintiff: RICHARD VERRECCHIO

Counsel of Record for this Party: Steven Auerbach, Esquire

Law Office of Steven T. Auerbach

822 Montgomery Ave.

Suite 210

Narberth, PA. 19072 Ph: (215) 964-4410 Fax: (610) 667-7305

Steven@TheAuerbachFirm.com

Pa. I.D. #317309

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VERRECCHIO,		)	CIVIL DIVISION
	Plaintiff;	)	
		)	Docket No.:
vs.		)	
		)	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,		)	
	Defendant.	)	

#### **I. COMPLAINT IN CIVIL ACTION**

Richard Verrecchio ("Mr. Verrecchio" or "Plaintiff"), by and through his attorney, Steven Auerbach, complaining of City of Philadelphia ("Defendant" or "Employer"), alleges:

#### **II. INTRODUCTION**

- 1. This action is brought to remedy claims of employment discrimination on the basis of sex and retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000 *et seq.* and under the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, 43 PA. Cons. Stat. § 951 *et seq.*
- 2. Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief, economic, compensatory, attorneys' fees and all other appropriate relief pursuant to governing law.

#### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violation of federal laws. There lies supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims because they arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as Plaintiff's federal claims asserted herein.
- 4. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over

Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S, 310 (1945) and its progeny.

5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district, and Defendants are deemed to reside where they are subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

#### IV. PARTIES

- 6. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 7. Plaintiff is an adult, caucasion individual who resides in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
- 8. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff was and remains an "Employee" of the Defendant within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. §2000e-f and related state law(s).
- 9. Defendant City of Philadelphia is a political subdivision organized under the laws of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 10. Defendant was and remains an "Employer" of the Plaintiff within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. §2000e-(b), (g), and (h) and related state law(s).
- 11. At all times relevant herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendant.
- 12. Defendant has and continues to employ over five hundred (500) employees per calendar year for at least the last five (5) years, and Defendant engages in a variety of revenue-generating, business relationships.

#### V. EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 13. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 14. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies.
- 15. On March 27, 2019, Plaintiff filed a complaint of hostile work environment, sexual harassment, and retaliation with the Mayor's Office of Labor Relations ("Office of Labor Relations") against his supervisor and agent of Defendant, Sheriff Jewell Williams ("Sheriff Williams") and related actors.
- 16. Plaintiff then filed a timely initial charge of employment discrimination with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") on March 27, 2019 and directed same to cross-file with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC").
- 17. Plaintiff received his Right to Sue Notice from the EEOC on June 21, 2019.
- 18. Plaintiff commenced an initial, un-amended action within ninety (90) days of receipt of his Right to Sue Notice.

#### VI. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 19. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 20. In March of 1992 and extending through the present (the "Term of Employment"), Plaintiff worked for Defendant in a variety of capacities.
- 21. The latter portion of the Term of Employment was marred by disparate treatment, harassment related to race (Mr. Verrocchio is white) and retaliation related to his participation/perceived participation in various intra-office sexual harassment complaints.
- 22. Plaintiff's supervisor, Sheriff Williams, harbored certain anti-white prejudices that he announced in and around the office on numerous occasions, including:

- a. "I don't trust white people;" and
- b. "I don't like white people- they are devils;" and
- c. "What, my [black] people are no good, buy all these fucking white people are good!?;" and
- d. "Are we switching up to white people now?;" and
- e. "I would hire a black person before I would hire a white person;" and
- f. "I don't trust when there are only white people in an office with the door shut."
- 23. Sheriff Williams would also flaunt his anti-white animus by attempting to publicly disparage light-skinned latino individuals such as Jennifer Algarin-Barnes by referring to them as "looking white." Additionally, Sheriff Williams falsely accused Plaintiff (who is a married man) of being the father of a coworker's child because, "It looks white" and even said that Plaintiff was trying to avoid paying child support.
- 24. As a white man, Plaintiff was deliberately excluded from certain work events and opportunities: on a date to be identified in discovery, a picture was taken to highlight the "diversity" of the Sheriff's office. Plaintiff was excluded from this picture, and in his stead appeared an african american, non-employee contractor. On another occasion, Sheriff Williams announced to a subordinate under threat of termination, "Verrecchio better not be invited to this [party]."
- 25. Plaintiff was also excluded from participating in Commanders' Meetings- depriving him of opportunities to advance his career and to increase his knowledge of department initiatives.

- 26. Plaintiff, as a white man, was never offered paid training or the customarily offered take-home car given to newly appointed captains. When Plaintiff complained, Sheriff Williams retaliated by demanding that he obtain ten new, unmarked cars.
- 27. Sheriff Williams denied Plaintiff's request to take on additional areas of responsibility, but acquiesced to identical requests made by similarly-situated, african american employees. Worse still, Plaintiff was stripped of his security responsibilities relative to 100 S. Broad Street and those responsibilities were given to an aftrican american employee.
- 28. Similarly, Sheriff Williams denied Plaintiff's request that his (white) daughter be hired, but acquiesced to identical requests made by similarly-situated, non-white employees.
- 29. Because of Plaintiff's race, Sheriff Williams attempted to belittle him in various ways including shouting in front of his staff that, "Verrecchio makes the most money!" or by attempting to reduce Plaintiff's operational significance, by omitting his areas of responsibility from the supervisory radio call sign list.
- 30. Sheriff Williams further attempted to coerce Plaintiff into purchasing a timeshare that he owned. When Plaintiff refused, Sheriff Williams reduced Plaintiff's overtime.
- 31. Sheriff Williams also attempted to improperly coerce Plaintiff into not filing a grievance against an african american employee: "Verrecchio, you better not do that."
- 32. Appearing visibly depressed as to how he was treated in the office, Sheriff Williams encouraged Plaintiff to kill himself. Sheriff Williams then offered him guidance on how to "properly do it" and that his suicide would be rewarded through a posthumous promotion to Chief Deputy and that he would "shut down Broad Street" by giving him a lavish funeral with honor guard and parade.

- 33. Shortly thereafter, Sheriff Williams said a "nursery rhyme" within earshot of Plaintiff about Plaintiff's death.
- 34. Sheriff Williams also retaliated against Plaintiff on the basis of his perceived association with Delores Ramos and his "failure" to prevent Delores Ramos from initiating/escalating her legal action against the Defendant.
- 35. Sheriff Williams openly accused Plaintiff of failing to prevent Ms. Ramos' \$460,000.00 sexual harassment settlement because she was "his girl." And, when it was announced in the office that Ms. Ramos has settled her case, Sheriff Williams threatened to strip Plaintiff of additional responsibilities.
- 36. Sheriff Williams openly flaunted his desire to punish Plaintiff and on one occasion said, "I know how to get him."
- 37. In further retaliation Sheriff Williams openly expressed to others in and around the office of his intention to "get" Plaintiff after his reelection.

# COUNT I: VERRECCHIO V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA <u>Violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")</u> <u>Violations of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA")</u> (Race)

- 38. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 39. In violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and PHRA, Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of his and by failing to protect him from pier/supervisor misconduct.
- 40. Defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and/or negligently in violation of these Acts.
- 41. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer irreparable mental and physical injury as well as monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory conduct as described herein.

# COUNT II: VERRECCHIO V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA <u>Violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")</u> <u>Violations of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA")</u> (Retaliation)

- 42. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 43. In violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the PHRA, Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff for failing to suppress others from exercising their legal rights and from testifying adversely against his supervisor.
- 44. Defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and/or negligently in violation of these Acts.
- 45. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer irreparable mental and physical injury as well as monetary damages as a result of Defendant's retaliatory conduct as described herein.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing:

- a. That the Court issue a declaratory judgment that the acts, policies, and practices complained herein are in violation of Title VII and the PHRA; and
- b. That the Court enjoin Defendant from continuing its acts, policies, and practices which violate Title VII and the PHRA; and
- c. Directing Defendant to reinstate Plaintiff to the position he would have occupied but for Defendant's unlawful conduct, making her whole for all earning she would have received but for Defendant's unlawful conduct, including but not limited to wages, bonuses and other lost benefits; and
- d. Directing Defendant to make Plaintiff whole by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, with interest, in amounts to be determined at trial pursuant; and

e. Directing Defendant to make Plaintiff whole by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses caused by the above unlawful conduct, including pain and suffering, emotional distress, indignity, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of self-esteem, and humiliation, in amounts to be determined at trial; and

f. Granting such other relief as the Court deems necessary and proper.

### **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to FRCP 38(b), Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by the complaint.

Dated: 6/21/19

Respectfully Submitted,

By:

Steven Auerbach 822 Montgomery Ave.

Suite 210

Narberth, PA. 19072 Ph: (215) 964-4410 Fax: (610) 667-7305

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VERRECCHIO,			CIVIL DIVISION
	Plaintiff;	)	
		)	Docket No.:
vs.		)	
		)	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,		)	
	Defendant.	)	

### **VERIFICATION**

I, Richard Verrecchio, hereby state I am the plaintiff in this action, and I verify that the statements made in the foregoing pleading are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that false statements made herein are subject to the penalties of 28 U.S.C. §1746 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Dated: 6/21/14

RICHARD VERRECCHIO

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	Charl Vc(rece		THIS FO	RM.) <b>DEFENDANTS</b>	Cita	of Phila	22/02,~		
(b) County of Residence of (E)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name,		Philodelphia ASES)		County of Residence  NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT  Attorneys (If Known)	of First List	ed Defendant  LAINTIFF CASES OON CASES, USE T	Philadel	·	
822 Mintgimein	Ase. Soite 210 1072 (21579								
II. BASIS OF JURISDI			II. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	I. PARTIES	(Place art V" in	One Box (	for Plainti
☐ 1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	ر المارات المار المرارات المارات المار	and One Box f		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citize	n of This State	1 29 1	Incorporated or Proof Business In		□ 4	<b>1</b> 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2 0 2	Incorporated and of Business In		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
				n or Subject of a eign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature		escription STATUT	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	710	EABOR  Description of Property 21 USC 881 Descripti	423 With 28 U   PROPE    820 Copy   830 Pater New   840 Trade   862 Black   863 DIW   864 SSID   865 RSI (  FEDER/ or D.   871 IRS- 26 U   871 IRS- 26 U	SC 157  RTY RIGHTS  rights  tt t Abbreviated Drug Application mark  SECURITY (1395ff) c Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  AL TAX SUITS  s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	480 Consum   490 Cable/S   850 Securiti   Exchan   890 Other S   891 Agricul   893 Environ   895 Freedon   Act   896 Arbitrat   899 Admini	in (31 USC ))  capportions of the control of the co	ged and ions  dities/ etions  tters nation
	moved from 3		4 Reins		erred from	☐ 6 Multidist		Multidis	
	te Court	Appellate Court	Reop	ened Anothe (specify)	er District	Litigation Transfer		Litigatio Direct Fi	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	به حلمال بالمال ا			o not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless di	versity);			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DI	EMAND \$		HECK YES only	1/	n complai	
VIII. RELATED CASE			<u> </u>	-,000,00					
DATE DATE	· .	JUDGE	ADAIES! A	EBECORD	DOCKE	T NUMBER _			
G(21/19	·	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	KNEYO	F KECUKD					

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Pich-12 Verrecchio	:	CIVIL ACTION		
v.	; ;			
City of Philadelphi	; ;	NO.		
plaintiff shall complete a Case filing the complaint and serve a side of this form.) In the evidesignation, that defendant sha the plaintiff and all other parti	e Management Track Designati a copy on all defendants. (See § ent that a defendant does not all, with its first appearance, so	duction Plan of this court, couns on Form in all civil cases at the ting 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reagree with the plaintiff regarding about to the clerk of court and ser Designation Form specifying the	me of everse g said ve on	
SELECT ONE OF THE FOI	LLOWING CASE MANAGE	MENT TRACKS:		
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases br	ought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241	through § 2255.	( )	
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.				
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvin exposure to asbestos.	g claims for personal injury or	property damage from	( )	
commonly referred to as c	ses that do not fall into tracks (omplex and that need special of this form for a detailed ex	or intense management by	( )	
(f) Standard Management – C	Cases that do not fall into any o	ne of the other tracks.	M	
6/21/19 Date	Steven Averbach	Plaint; fp		
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for		
(215) 964-4410	(610) 667-7305	Averbach. Steven Ogn	14, 7. (0)	
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### **DESIGNATION FORM**

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 5392 Loo	x Dr. 5 234	Doylestown 117	18907	_
Address of Defendant: One Parkary 12	1th Flor 1515,	Arch Street Phil	Adoph PA 1960	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	Philodon			-
	-			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:				
Case Number:	Judge:		Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answere	d to any of the followin	g questions:		
Is this case related to property included in an expreviously terminated action in this court?	arlier numbered suit per	nding or within one year	Yes No X	
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or pending or within one year previously terminate	grow out of the same ted action in this court?	ransaction as a prior suit	Yes No 7	
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringer numbered case pending or within one year prev	nent of a patent already viously terminated actio	in suit or any earlier n of this court?	Yes No	
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corputate filed by the same individual?	us, social security appea	al, or pro se civil rights	Yes No X	
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above.	·			
DATE: 6/21/15	Steven Au	erharh	017311	
	Attorney-at-L	aw / Pro Se Plaintiff	Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)	
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)				
A. Federal Question Cases:		B. Diversity Jurisdiction	Cases:	
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and				
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	All Other Contracts	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defar 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi	nation lal Injury Personal Injury I Injury (Please specify): Lity Asbestos rsity Cases	
<ul> <li>2. FELA</li> <li>3. Jones Act-Personal Injury</li> <li>4. Antitrust</li> <li>5. Patent</li> <li>6. Labor-Management Relations</li> <li>7. Civil Rights</li> <li>8. Habeas Corpus</li> <li>9. Securities Act(s) Cases</li> <li>10. Social Security Review Cases</li> <li>11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):</li> </ul>	ARBITRAT	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defar 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi 8. Products Liabi 9. All other Dive (Please specify)	onal Injury nation  Injury Personal Injury I Injury (Please specify):  Ility — Asbestos  rsity Cases	-
2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  (The effective for the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive for the sum of \$	ARBITRAT  t of this certification is to  counsel of record or pro se  2), that to the best of m  of interest and costs:	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defar 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi 8. Products Liabi 9. All other Dive (Please specify)	onal Injury nation  Injury Personal Injury I Injury (Please specify):  Ility — Asbestos  rsity Cases	
2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  (The effect	ARBITRAT  t of this certification is to  counsel of record or pro se  2), that to the best of m  of interest and costs:	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defar 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi 8. Products Liabi 9. All other Dive (Please specify).	onal Injury nation nal Injury Personal Injury I Injury (Please specify): Lity Lity — Asbestos rsity Cases : Lity Lity — Asbestos	
2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  (The effect I, Sugar Augustion Cases)  Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of \$150,00	ARBITRATe of this certification is to counsel of record or prosection. The best of most interest and costs:  Sheven Area.	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defar 4. Marine Person 5. Motor Vehicle 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liabi 8. Products Liabi 9. All other Dive (Please specify).	onal Injury nation lal Injury Personal Injury I Injury (Please specify): Ility Clity – Asbestos rsity Cases  ty for arbitration.)  damages recoverable in this civil action case	-